

MINUTES OF THE
MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS
TRANSPORTATION ENHANCEMENT FUNDS WORKING GROUP

Friday, June 18, 2004 – 8:30 a.m.
MAG Office Building, Suite 200 - Cholla Room
302 North First Avenue, Phoenix

MEMBERS PRESENT

Councilman Greg Stanton, Co-Chair, Phoenix
Mike Hutchinson, Co-Chair, Mesa,
representing the MAG Management
Committee
Grant Anderson, Goodyear, representing the
MAG Street Committee
Angela Dye, A Dye Design, representing the
American Society of Landscape Architects,
Arizona Chapter
Marcie Ellis, West Valley Fine Arts Council,
representing the Arts Community

Reed Kempton, Maricopa County Dept. of
Transportation, representing the MAG
Pedestrian Working Group
*Andre Licardi, Arizona Commission of the
Arts
Mary O'Connor, Scottsdale, representing the
MAG Regional Bicycle Task Force
Doug Kupel, Arizona Preservation Foundation,
representing the Archaeological and Historic
Preservation Community

* Not Present

OTHERS PRESENT

Phil Jeselnick, ADOT
Scott Cisson, ASU East
Melinda Brimhall, Chandler
Mike Normand, Chandler
Ed Mccure, Citizen
Diane Bishop, Encanto Palmcroft Historic
Preservation Association
Gregory P. Davies, Glendale
Mike Gregory, Glendale
Paula Moloff, Glendale
Terry Johnson, Glendale
Linda Snidecor, Goodyear
Laura Paty, HDR Engineering
Dawn M. Coomer, MAG
Roxana Rojo, Maricopa County Parks

Bill Scalzo, Maricopa County
Tim Barnard, Mesa
Andrea Madonna, Mesa
Debbie Abele, Papago Salado Association
Burton Charron, Peoria
Louisa Garbo, Peoria
Chris Andres, Phoenix
Barbara Stocklin, Phoenix
Lynn Timmons, Phoenix
Don Keuth, Phoenix Community Alliance
David Meinhart, Scottsdale
Eric Iwersen, Tempe
Tonya Forbrook, Wickenburg
Linda Pollock, Windsor Square

1. Call to Order

Co-Chair Mike Hutchinson called the meeting to order at 8:35 a.m. He asked members of the Enhancement Funds Working Group to introduce themselves.

2. Approval of the April 6, 2004 Meeting Minutes of the Enhancement Funds Working Group

Grant Anderson moved to approve the April 6, 2004 meeting minutes of the Enhancement Funds Working Group. Mary O'Connor seconded the motion and the motion passed unanimously.

3. Introduction of Working Group Members and Members of the Audience

Members of the audience introduced themselves.

4. Call to the Audience

No members of the audience wished to address the Working Group.

5. Staff Report

Ms. Coomer addressed the Working Group. Ms. Coomer stated that there was a meeting of the state Transportation Enhancement Review Committee in May 2004. MAG staff and members of this working group provided comments at the meeting with concerns about the process. We explained that obtaining only 10 percent of the funding is unreasonable, and that the state committee needs to honor regional rankings. We provided information to the committee on the good job MAG members do on implementing these projects. Minutes of the meeting are available as a handout on the table.

In addition, the State Transportation Board has created a sub-committee to look at the current process the state uses for transportation enhancement funding. Ms. Coomer noted that she had been informed by ADOT staff that this group might meet the second week of July. Agenda items include project ranking process and project distribution. Ms. Coomer promised to keep the committee informed once a date was finalized. Ms. Coomer offered to take questions from the committee.

Marcie Ellis asked if the state committee would now honor regional rankings, and asked what the committee could do to help this process. Ms. Coomer stated that attendance at the TERC meetings by members of this committee is very helpful. The committee was very receptive to listening to members at the May meeting. Co-Chair Stanton added that applicants and committee members should also attend the state ranking meeting in Flagstaff this year. Ms. Ellis asked if the state legislature should be contacted and involved in some way. Mr. Kupel added that all in the room have an interest in the outcome and process used for the state enhancement program.

Grant Anderson stated that this committee should work closely with the State Transportation Board and the appointed sub-committee to honor the local rankings. He recommended that the state legislature be involved only once other communication avenues are exhausted. Mary O'Connor agreed, and added that the committee and applicants should attend the statewide meeting in Flagstaff. Co-Chair Stanton stated that the region will never get a fair share based on population, but that obtaining only 10 percent is unreasonable.

6. Review and Discussion of Round XII Enhancement Fund Applications

Ms. Coomer addressed the Working Group, noting that a summary of the Round XII applications was included with the agenda packet. Two applications were received after the May 28, 2004 deadline and the Working Group will be asked to discuss whether to consider the applications. Ms. Coomer stated that on at least one occasion in her work with the enhancement funds process, an application had been rejected. All publicity material states the deadline for the submission of applications and also states that late applications are not accepted. Ms. Coomer added that she felt it was important for the Working Group to adhere to its own adopted process to help applicants trust the overall ranking and evaluation process. Ms. Coomer stated that she had received two phone calls from member agency staff who were very concerned about the fairness of considering the late application. However, these people were uncomfortable addressing the committee directly with their comments since they had applications being considered by the Working Group this year. Ms. Coomer added that Scottsdale had written a letter that had been distributed to the entire committee. She offered to read the letter or provide copies if the committee was interested. The letter was not read.

Co-Chair Hutchinson asked Ms. Coomer if committee members are allowed to vote on their own proposals. Ms. Coomer responded that the committee does not have a formal policy that requires members to remove themselves from voting. However, if committee members are uncomfortable voting on a certain application, they can omit that application from their ranking and the totals can be adjusted accordingly. Ms. O'Connor noted that she would not participate in the discussion of the Scottsdale applications as indicated in her letter to the committee.

Ms. Ellis asked if the committee had rejected applications before, and Ms. Coomer noted that they had. Co-Chair Stanton stated that this application would not have qualified anyway. Ms. Coomer replied that the application would have been considered, but was not complete since it lacked a local government sponsor. It is common for applications to be accepted without local support letters and resolutions with the understanding that the information must be provided before the application is submitted to ADOT.

Co-Chair Hutchinson stated that whether to accept and consider the Scottsdale applications is a difficult decision. However, it is important for all of us to comply with the rules that have been created for this process. Co-Chair Hutchinson moved to not accept and consider the Scottsdale applications in this round because they were submitted late. Ms. Ellis seconded the motion.

Reed Kempton suggested that the one proposal that was so highly ranked last year be included in this year's process. Grant Anderson stated that this was a difficult decision due to the relationships that the committee had built. He voiced appreciation for how the committee works together. However, Phoenix or Goodyear might come in late next year with proposals. How could that situation be addressed? Mr. Anderson stated that he would vote in agreement with the motion.

Co-Chair Stanton called for a vote. The motion passed with Co-Chair Stanton voting no and Mary O'Connor not voting.

Ms. Coomer continued by explaining the review process at today's meeting. Each application will be introduced by MAG staff, which will be followed by a three minute presentation by the applicant that describes the key elements of the project. A maximum public comment period of five minutes for each application follows the presentation provided by the applicant. Then, a maximum 10 minute question-and-answer period for each proposal is led by EFWG co-chairs.

Ms. Coomer added that applicants are also required to submit a written response to comments raised by EFWG members at today's meeting prior to the ranking meeting of the EFWG. The written response should be directed to MAG staff by fax or e-mail by Friday, June 25, 2004 at Noon. Ms. Coomer provided her contact information.

Applications were then heard in the order received by MAG staff by the May 28, 2004 deadline.

Wickenburg - US 60 Multi-Use Path

Tonya Forbrook addressed the Working Group. She stated this project was necessary due to a cost overrun on phase one of the project. The total project would be three miles in length and was needed by the community. People need a safe way to travel by bicycle in the community. The district engineer supports and is sponsoring the project.

Ms. O'Connor asked why the path design was both asphalt and concrete. Ms. Forbrook stated she would have to verify the design, but it was done by the district engineer. The area is very hilly and excavation and fill will be necessary with the project. Ms. O'Connor suggested that concrete be considered since asphalt is not as stable long term.

Ms. O'Connor asked if the bicycle edge lane is an on-street bike lane? The correct terminology should be used in the application. She suggested that the comparison study should be removed from the proposal since there won't be sufficient data to address the safety of the two bicycle facilities. Ms. O'Connor noted that both facilities can be designed safely, but they serve two different types of bicyclists. She suggested that the ADOT bicycle coordinator could assist with the terminology issues.

Ms. Ellis asked if the entire project was designed in phase one? Ms. Forbrook replied that it was. Ms. Ellis asked if the issues that caused the project to increase in price were now addressed? Ms. Forbrook stated that a lot of earthwork had to be done, and that these issues are addressed in the application. Ms. Forbrook added that the application had been reviewed by ADOT transportation enhancement staff and that the cost estimate included all the elements necessary to complete the project.

Reed Kempton stated the reference to on-street bicycle facilities not being safe should be removed from the proposal. Mr. Kempton stated that there is ongoing discussion about the safety of difference types of facilities. He stated that since there is no data on the safety of the facility, there should not be references to the new project improving safety in the area. Ms. Forbrook noted that families with children do not feel comfortable using the on-street bicycle lane. Mr. Kempton asked how the commercial areas would be accessed at the corner of Vulture Mine if the multi-use path is 20 to 25 feet from the right-of-way.

Mr. Anderson stated that instead of safety, the application should note that this multi-use path would be “more acceptable to families with small children.” Ms. Forbrook agreed that this facility would fulfill a need in the community. Mr. Kempton stated that both facilities are needed to meet the needs of different cyclists. He added that there is a bicycle lane in this area.

Co-Chair Stanton reminded applicants that the committee will be asking a lot of questions about the proposals. It is acceptable for applicants to research their responses and provide them to the committee at a later time.

Glendale - Grand Canal Linear Park and Trail Development

Mike Gregory addressed the Working Group. He provided a memorandum responding to the staff comments on the proposal. The applicant proposes constructing two nodes/rest areas along Grand Canal Linear path. The nodes will provide a safe and distinct route for pedestrians, bicyclists, ingress and egress, and also serve as a rest area. The nodes will include benches, drinking fountains, bike racks, aesthetically pleasing landscape and shade ramadas. The nodes are an extension of the 4.5 mile path system, which helps connect residents to several schools, a golf course, public safety complexes, and a variety of business and retail areas.

Ms. O'Connor suggested that the meandering be removed from the path since it is not beneficial to bicyclists. In addition, barbeque grills are not eligible for transportation enhancement funds and they should be removed from the proposal. Ms. O'Connor asked if the bus pullouts are funded as a part of the proposal? Mr. Gregory responded that they are not included, but are in future plans. Ms. O'Connor suggested that they be removed from the proposal since their mention is confusing. Also, bus pullouts help cars and traffic, not transit users.

Ms. O'Connor stated that the surface treatment must meet ADA and there should be a clear path of travel free from obstructions. Mr. Kupel stated that on page 17, question 15 part A has some grammatical errors. Also, the mention of the vandalism tracking system seems irrelevant. The connections to regional facilities should be mentioned. Mr. Kupel stated that it would be helpful to have more than one letter of support for the project.

Mr. Anderson stated that the presentation was helpful. He stated that the linkage to the new park at 83rd and Bethany could also be mentioned. Ms. Ellis stated that the retail linkage was planned, correct? Mr. Gregory confirmed that the retail is in future plans, and stated that the application would be changed to clarify this. Ms. O'Connor stated that on page 8, the term “bus cutouts” is used. This is an incorrect term.

Ms. Dye stated that the maps in black-and-white are not legible. Mr. Anderson stated that a letter of support from Phoenix would be helpful as the project links to the Grand Canal in Phoenix. Mr. Kempton added that this is a part of the Maricopa County Trails Plan, and the MAG ROSS plan. These plans should be mentioned in question 17. Ms. Ellis stated that the art component of the project is a nice feature.

Glendale-Bicycle-Pedestrian Bridge (63rd Ave. at Loop 101)

Terry Johnson addressed the Working Group to provide an overview of the project. The project is along Loop 101 at the 63rd Avenue alignment, an important bicycle corridor in the community. The project will help link residents to schools, parks and employment. There are also links to Skunk Creek and the Arizona Canal. Mr. Johnson referred to a project display board and highlighted these destinations.

Mr. Johnson stated that an artist will be involved in the construction of the project. A DCR has been completed. There have been seven public meetings and the project has been approved by the citizen transportation commission and bicycle committee. There is a council letter of support for the project.

Mr. Johnson showed a display board of the freeway. The freeway is depressed in this area so the bridge will be at grade. There will also be underpasses at frontage roads due to the high travel speeds of vehicles in the area. There will not be a tunnel; citizens desire a more open concept. The project is now ready for design.

Ed Kerr, citizen, addressed the Working Group. He stated that the project is very important to Glendale. This will be the only non-motorized bridge west of I-17 that crosses 101. This will create a grade separated connection for those who live south of 101 and want to get to the park. Other bicycle crossings are not grade separated.

Ms. O'Connor asked about the width of the facility, and Mr. Johnson replied it is 14 feet wide. Ms. O'Connor suggested that the application also address the connectivity of the project instead of just the safety components. The application overemphasizes safety. Ms. O'Connor stated that the project application is very good. It is good to involve an artist as part of the design team. Most artists don't like to come into a project once it is already designed.

Mr. Kupel stated that more support letters would be helpful since there is obviously a lot of support for the project as shown by the citizen comment. Mr. Anderson added that the regional connectivity aspects of the project to the Arizona Canal, etc., should be mentioned in the application.

Glendale - Old Roma Alley Pedestrian Enhancements and Landscape Beautification

Paula Moloff addressed the Working Group. This application was also submitted last year. The project will enhance an alleyway in the downtown area from Glendale to Glenn. The size of the project is 140 feet by 20 feet. It will connect Murphy Park, parking lots, and city hall. Many have been involved in the design, including landscape architects, an artist, business owners and homeowners. The project will also include lighting. Utilities will be undergrounded by the city.

Ms. Moloff stated that a council resolution for all the Glendale projects is forthcoming. Mr. Anderson asked about the priorities, and Ms. Moloff noted that this project is the highest priority local project. Ms. O'Connor asked about the faux balconies on the wall, and Ms. Moloff explained the concept. Ms. O'Connor asked about the surface, and Ms. Moloff noted that stamped concrete would be used. Ms. O'Connor suggested that the application clarify the surface that will be used.

Ms. O'Connor asked about the artist, and Ms. Moloff noted that Glendale has a percentage for the arts program that will be used in this project. Ms. O'Connor suggested that the application be clarified to show where artistic opportunities will be included.

Ms. Dye stated that the balcony concept may not appeal to the TERC. She suggested that the application be modified to state that art will be included, and that the term "comfort and scale for pedestrians" be used instead. She suggested that a "public art element" be referred to in the proposal rather than going into so much detail about the balcony.

Mr. Anderson suggested that a support from the business owners be obtained, and that the application be clarified on the use of pavement. Ms. Ellis asked if Rex Gulbrandson was involved in the project, and Ms. Moloff stated that Mr. Gulbrandson manages the Glendale art program and that he is involved in the project.

Maricopa County Parks - Maricopa Trail from I-17 West to Lake Pleasant

Bill Scalzo addressed the Working Group. He noted that Chris Coover was away from the office. This project is being submitted by Maricopa County as a collaboration among many different departments. The plan is to acquire right of way along Old Hall Road for a distance of 7.2 miles, and then create a trail along the right of way. An application has been submitted to the state to buy the right of way. The local match will come from grading, signage and landscaping. The project connects to many cities and communities and is a link of the Maricopa Trail. Mr. Scalzo noted that the staff comments are being addressed in the revision of the application, and more letters of support will be obtained.

Ms. O'Connor stated that the application is difficult to judge without a cross-section. Does the project meet ADA and AASHTO? Mr. Scalzo stated that the project will meet the trail design guidelines of the Maricopa Trail document, due to be adopted by the Board of Supervisors on July 6. Ms. O'Connor asked for the width of the trail, and Mr. Scalzo replied it would be 10 feet wide. Ms. O'Connor added that the application overstated the benefit of the project to 3.2 million residents of the entire region. Mr. Scalzo noted that Lake Pleasant has over 1.2 million visitors annually.

Mr. Hutchinson asked where the library is, and Mr. Scalzo replied that the regional library will be off Daisy Mountain Road. Ms. Dye asked about the surface of the trail. Mr. Scalzo stated that the surface will be compacted material, not hard surfaced. There will be multiple users. Ms. Dye asked if the trail will meet ADA? Mr. Scalzo stated that it would, but that no asphalt or concrete will be used. ADA can be met at a lower cost, in a manner similar to that done in many county parks.

Ms. Dye stated that the application needs to elaborate upon the trail surface. She added that 7.2 miles is a very lengthy. Also, the project will connect to the Agua Fria/New River corridor, which has been funded with enhancements in prior years. This connection should be noted in the application.

Ms. Ellis asked if the facility would be open all day, and Mr. Scalzo replied that it would. Ms. Ellis requested that artistic elements be integrated into the project, including the signage and any

benches. Mr. Scalzo noted that the project will be aesthetically pleasing and will include wildflowers, benches and signage. Ms. Ellis requested that artists be employed with the project.

Mr. Kupel stated that the application should note the primary category of evaluation. Also, on page 7, question 17, the statement of the project benefit is overstated. In addition, the archeological clearance is not an enhancement; it is a necessary part of the project. The history classes are unrelated to the overall project. The Clancy Jayne support letter is too general. The Peoria letter should be more current and relate to this specific project.

Mr. Anderson stated that in general, the application needs to be modified to emphasize the transportation component of the project rather than the recreational aspects.

Peoria - 84th Avenue Streetscape Improvement Project

Louisa Garbo addressed the Working Group. The project builds on policies previously adopted by Peoria, including the Downtown Peoria Redevelopment Plan, the Central Peoria Revitalization Plan, and the Peoria General Plan. This project integrates with other existing and proposed downtown projects, including a performing arts theater, the funded transportation enhancement project at Peoria and US 60, and park and ride lots. The city has had help from ASU in creating a downtown campus plan, a facade study and a downtown appearance guide. The goal of the project is to improve a streetscape that is not pedestrian friendly into one that residents can use and enjoy.

Ms. O'Connor asked about the width of the sidewalk. Ms. Garbo noted that the sidewalk is currently only 5 feet wide, and it will be wider. Peoria wants to work with a consultant and integrate their ideas into the proposed concept. Ms. O'Connor said the application should be changed to include the width of the sidewalk. Ms. O'Connor also noted that the decorative pavers shown in the conceptual plan will not meet ADA since they are not a detectible warning device.

Mr. Kupel stated that the primary project category should be mentioned in the application. He added that the letters of support in the application are very good.

Goodyear - Bullard Wash Multi-Use Path

Linda Snedikor addressed the Working Group to provide an overview of the project. Ms. Snedikor stated that this is the first multi-use path system in Goodyear and means a lot to the community. The path will allow safe travel to and from work, shopping, sporting events and city services. The path will provide a vital linkage from south Goodyear to Van Buren Street. The goals of the project are to provide connectivity, increase pedestrian travel and safety, and reduce air pollution. The first phase of the project will have the most benefit. This is a cost effective project. The goal is to have the path constructed by 2007 when a regional mall, sports stadium, city hall complex and other planned development are in place.

Ms. O'Connor noted that this resubmittal from last year is much improved and very good. Will there be lighting with the project? Ms. Snedikor stated that lighting would be included. Ms.

O'Connor suggested that the term "physically challenged" be replaced with "people with disabilities" or "disabled."

Ms. Ellis stated that an artist should be included in the design of the project. Ms. Snedikor replied that the project design has been completed, but that artists could be involved in other phases of the project. Mr. Kempton stated that the "Maricopa County Flood Control District" is really "Flood Control District of Maricopa County." Mr. Kempton added that regional connections should be emphasized in the project application. Ms. Snedikor thanked members for their comments, and stated that updated support letters are coming.

Mr. Kupel asked about the stadium, and Ms. Snedikor stated that the proposed stadium will be used for spring training. Mr. Kupel stated that the project map showed that the project is close to the airport, and would there be any potential conflicts?

Goodyear - Litchfield Road and Estrella Parkway at I-10 Beautification

Linda Snedikor addressed the Working Group to provide an overview of the project. The landscaping and scenic beautification project will help alleviate visual blight at the Litchfield and Estrella Parkway ramps. This project responds to community concerns about the area, will help enhance tourism and travel, and is a synergy of economic development, neighborhood revitalization and downtown redevelopment strategies. Ms. Snedikor showed photos of the project area. The Litchfield Road interchange is characterized by lack of vegetation, chain link fence and deteriorating sidewalks, which is an uninviting, unattractive entrance to the city's primary retail and employment corridors. The lack of vegetation and the condition of existing gravel at Litchfield Road offers freeway travelers a poor invitation to return to the community. Unsightly deteriorating conditions at Litchfield Road do little to promote quality of life in a city committed to providing such for its residents and visitors alike.

The Estrella Parkway interchange is a rather bland introduction to the city's soon-to-be gateway corridor to the future downtown. The lack of vegetation and landscaping at Estrella Parkway does little to promote the benefits of life in two of the city's finest master-planned communities accessible from this important interchange. Little to no attention has been paid to creating any kind of welcoming introduction to Goodyear at Estrella Parkway.

Ms. Snedikor noted that the design renderings use various themes to create designs on earthen triangles between the freeway on/off ramps. The design will help to enhance community image and pride, and reinforce the city's history and founding. It is hoped to generate community support and involvement with a design contest and design selection process. Design renderings are conceptual and need to meet ADOT guidelines.

Barbara Coff addressed the Working Group from the city's economic development department. She noted that these entrances are very prominent in the community and that this project will help promote more community identity.

Ms. O'Connor asked about the width of the new sidewalk shown in the photos. Why is an improved sidewalk not included with this proposal? Ms. Snedikor noted that this is a scenic enhancement project. Ms. O'Connor stated that the use of concrete pavers in the crosswalk may

not meet ADA. She asked who designed the aesthetic? Ms. Snedcor stated that the city had been working with a landscape architect. Ms. O'Connor suggested that a different, and perhaps better, result would be obtained with the use of an artist.

Mr. Kempton commented that on page 15, the text referred to bolting the art to the pavement. Mr. Kempton stated that care would be needed to ensure that the metal would not pose a slipping hazard to pedestrians. Ms. Ellis noted that she appreciated the artistic component in the project, and noted that using artists can help the town to create a unified approach to all interchanges, yet each one could be a bit distinctive as well.

Ms. Dye stated that a combination of enhancement categories is encouraged by this committee. Ms. Ellis stated that the visual appeal of projects sometimes increases their use. Mr. Kupel stated that this project has a good inclusion and consideration of the history of the area. He added that the support letters for the project are excellent.

Phoenix - Arcadia Portal Multi-Use Trail Enhancement Project

Debbie Abele addressed the Working Group to provide an overview of the project. This project was also submitted last year. There is historical interpretation with the project, and this project will remove a gap in a regional trail system. There are two members of the public that will be speaking about the importance of this project; however, they were told to attend at 10:30. Co-Chair Stanton said that the committee could hear the citizens when they arrived.

Mr. Kupel complemented the applicant on the inclusion of historic preservation in the project. Ms. O'Connor stated that the proposal is excellent and improved over last year. This is a good transportation enhancement project.

Mr. Kempton stated that the project is excellent. He suggested that photo two should shown the same area as photo one in the appendix. Ms. Ellis asked about the regional connections of the project, and Ms. Abele stated the numerous regional connections to the north and south of the project.

Phoenix - Historic Street Light Rehabilitation Project

Barb Stocklin addressed the Working Group. Ms. Stocklin showed a map of the project area and the three neighborhoods affected by the project. The project is prompted by neighborhood concerns. These lights are some of the few remaining original historic lights in the entire state. The city has completed a historic streetlight restoration study that identifies all improvements needed. The city has also just adopted a streetlight policy for historic districts. Ms. Stocklin showed photos of the existing damage to streetlights in the districts. This project will restore 94 concrete poles and 29 metal poles. Historically appropriate luminaries will be replaced as needed. Other restoration work will include lead abatement, cleaning and painting of metal poles, repair of damaged concrete poles and recasting of concrete poles, other mechanical and electrical work, and replacement of historically appropriate replacement poles where repair is not possible. Ms. Stocklin stated that SHPO has been involved with the project and is supportive of the city's new streetlight policy.

Linda Pollack of the Phoenix Historic Preservation Commission addressed the Working Group. She stated that this project is very important to residents. She added that the casting of poles can be duplicated in other neighborhoods. Increased pedestrian activity is expected in the area because of the new light rail project.

Diane Bishop of the Encanto-Palmcroft District addressed the Working Group. She noted that the damaged lights are a huge concern to the homeowners association and that faux lights in the area are not attractive or appropriate. Restoration of these important historic lights is more appropriate.

Mr. Kupel stated that this is an excellent historic preservation project. He suggested that the question 20 of the application be amended to state that the lights are an important contributing element to the historic designation of the neighborhoods. Ms. O'Connor stated that this is a good application, and that the long term investment and benefit of recasting the concrete poles should be noted in the application.

Co-Chair Stanton recognized Dan Colton who addressed the Working Group to support the Arcadia Portal project. Mr. Colton has been working on this project since 1991. This is an important missing link for the entire trail system. Residents support the project because a safe route for children to get to school is needed. He asked the Working Group to rank this project high because it has been an important issue for many years.

Phoenix - Downtown Gateway Pedestrian Enhancement Project

Chris Andres addressed the Working Group. The project will include new 10 foot paths and accessible ramps, new landscaping to shade walks and create a buffer between pedestrians and traffic, enhanced crosswalks, count-down timers, new street furniture and new pedestrian lighting. This project is important because it connects gaps in the downtown walking system. The project will link to the newly expanded Civic Plaza and complement expansion plans for ASU Downtown. Mr. Andres showed some sample enhancement cross-sections.

Don Keuth addressed the Working Group. Mr. Keuth represents the Phoenix Community Alliance, a group working on the Phoenix Futures project. This project is important to help rejuvenate downtown. It is need to create pedestrian connections throughout the downtown area. Neighborhoods support wider sidewalks and shade trees. In addition, 7th Street is a barrier for people who want to walk in downtown.

Brian Kearny of the Downtown Phoenix Partnership addressed the Working Group in support of the project. He stated that it is very important to improve walking conditions downtown.

Ms. Ellis asked if an artist was involved with the project, and Mr. Andres replied that an artist was not currently involved but that one could be involved. Grant Anderson noted that Phoenix requires developers to provide sidewalks as parcels are redeveloped. Wouldn't this project be funded by developers at some later date? Mr. Andres replied that some might be funded later. However, much of the development is near ASU and there is an expectation of other sources of funding. ASU is unable to improve areas that are not owned by them. Also, the city has invested over \$55 million in this area so far.

Ms. O'Connor noted that the project does not qualify under category 2. Also, the project application should define an enhanced crosswalk. Mr. Andres noted that the crosswalks will have different treatments. John Siefert added that enhanced paving will be used to delineate the crosswalk.

Mr. Anderson asked for the priority of the Phoenix projects. Co-Chair Stanton asked Lynn Timmons, who replied that the lighting project is a higher priority than this project. Also, the Papago Salado project should stand on its own since Phoenix is only acting as the fiscal agent for the project.

Reed Kempton asked if it would be possible to add bicycle lanes on 7th Street with this project? This would be a good connection to bike lanes further south. Mr. Siefert stated that this could be considered, but that right of way along 7th Street is fairly constrained. Mr. Kupel stated that question 20 needed to refer to a "historic district" and that the text below photo 2 on page 12 could highlight the protection of a historic resource.

Gila Bend - Pedestrian Walkway

Ms. Coomer noted that the Town of Gila Bend has requested that this application be withdrawn from consideration.

Chandler - Bicycle Lanes, Chandler Blvd. through Price/Loop 101 Corridor

Mike Normand addressed the Working Group. This is an ADOT sponsored project that will allow for continuation of bicycle lanes along Chandler through the Price Road/Loop 101 corridor. The bike lanes currently end just east and west of the intersection. Chandler Blvd. is a major arterial in Chandler. Chandler has been adding bicycle lanes along Chandler Blvd. since it is identified on the city's bike plan. Currently over 8 miles of Chandler Blvd. has bike lanes. Major elements of the project include modification of medians, modification of outside curb lanes, relocation of signal poles and restoration of landscaping. There is currently not enough pavement to extend the bike lanes through the intersection. Approximately 75 percent of the right of way of the project is ADOT owned.

Ms. O'Connor asked if the sidewalk would be redone as a part of this project? Mr. Normand replied that this project is for the bike lanes only. Ms. O'Connor asked about the current width of the sidewalk and Mr. Normand replied that it is the standard for ADOT, probably five or six feet in width. Ms. O'Connor stated that the project would be more of an enhancement with the addition of a better sidewalk. Mr. Normand noted that the bike lane would meet AASHTO.

Mr. Kempton asked if the queuing for the bicycle lane would be to the left of the rather long right turn lane at that intersection? Mr. Normand replied that it would. Mr. Kempton added that the application could be strengthened by noting that Price Road is already a commonly used bicycle facility. Mr. Kupel stated that more support letters are needed in the application. Ms. Ellis asked if there would be any bicycle racks or resting areas, and Mr. Normand stated that the project is for the bicycle lanes only. Ms. Dye stated that worksheet 2A as mentioned in the application was missing, and Mr. Normand replied he would have to let the committee know later about the missing worksheet.

Chandler - Bus Stops

Melinda Brimhall addressed the Working Group. Ms. Brimhall explained that many bus stops currently exist without shading and referred to some photos of this situation. Ms. Brimhall also referred to some photos of bus stops with shade and furniture. This project proposes to place two or three shade trees at 25 bus stops located throughout the city. There is a great demand from transit users for additional shade. The application also includes 10 benches and trash receptacles. The landscaping will be maintained by the city.

Mr. Anderson asked if bus pullouts were included in the proposal, and Ms. Brimhall replied that they are not included. Ms. Dye stated that this project would be more appropriate for transit enhancements and doesn't appear to fit into the transportation enhancement program. Ms. Brimhall noted that citizens frequently request additional shade at bus stops and this funding was available. Ms. O'Connor agreed that the project is more appropriate for transit enhancements. Ms. Dye added that shade is a necessity for bus riders and should not be considered an enhancement. Ms. Ellis suggested that an artist be included in the design of the benches. Mr. Kupel stated that better letters of support for the project are needed. Mr. Kupel also mentioned that Chandler had done a historic tree study, and could the results of that study be integrated into this project?

Tempe - Tempe Bike Station at Downtown Tempe Transit Center

Eric Iwersen addressed the Working Group. He noted that this project had also been submitted last year. He referred committee members to the photos in the back of the application. Mr. Iwersen stated that this project is part of the larger transit center project and will include secured indoor bike parking. The bike station is near ASU and the path system on Hayden Butte. This area has the highest residential density in the entire state and there is much bike and pedestrian travel in this area. The bike station will include showers and rest rooms. The concept is modeled on existing bike stations in the western U.S. This will facilitate bike to bus transfers and integrate well with the planned light rail system.

Ms. O'Connor stated that the photos in the appendix need to be clarified to show the elements of the project. Mr. Anderson suggested that the local match doesn't show the true community impact of the project, and suggested that a higher local match would help the project.

Mr. Kempton asked if the bike station name was trademarked, and Mr. Iwersen stated that he is aware of the trademark. The final name for the project remains to be determined. The name is used with permission of those who created the bike station concept. Mr. Kempton suggested that the application be changed to explain this issue. Mr. Kupel suggested that question 20 should refer to the National Register of Historic Places.

Mr. Kupel asked who would use the project. Mr. Iwersen stated that this would be better addressed in the application when it is revised. The facility will not replace parking at building entrances. Instead, it will supplement bicycle parking and provide secure parking for expensive bicycles. Also, this will help facilitate bicycle transfers to light rail or bus. Mr. Kempton confirmed that the secure parking would be a great feature for those with expensive bicycles.

Mr. Anderson asked about the timing of the project. Is it premature to get funding for this project now instead of waiting until the light rail is in place? Mr. Iwersen stated that the design for the transit center is being done now with an opening planned for December, 2006. The timing is perfect.

Ms. Ellis asked about an art element with the project. Mr. Iwersen stated that this is still being determined, but a possibility is that the light rail artist will have a role. Another possibility is an artistic tribute to the Native American community.

Tempe - Tempe Crosscut Canal Multi-Use Path Phase II

Mr. Iwersen provided an overview of this project. This is the second and final phase of this path system that connects to Papago Park. The path is located in North Tempe and is one mile long. The project will include preservation of old landscaping near a riparian area and mature sonoran desert. The goal of this project is to consolidate illegal trails in Papago Park which, when used, cause erosion. There is much community support for this project.

Mr. Anderson asked for Tempe's ranking of the projects, and Mr. Iwersen stated that the bike station project was the highest priority.

Ms. O'Connor suggested that the Papago Salado Association submit this project with Tempe acting as a fiscal agent. Also, there is a high match with this project and phasing might be a consideration.

Mr. Kempton stated that question 17 should note the regional connections to the trail system, and could also note that this is the first bicycle facility to link Tempe and Phoenix.

ASU East - Backus Mall

Mr. Scott Cisson addressed the Working Group. This area will be the key pedestrian spine of the ASU campus. The campus used to be a military base. There are currently 850 families on campus and 3,500 students who will be able to use this. There are plans to expand ASU East as well. This project will block the street from car travel and make it accessible for non-motorized access only. Art will be incorporated into the project. ASU will underground the utilities in the area. This project was designed with the MAG Pedestrian Design Assistance Program and the design is nearly complete. ASU is now working to raise funds for the construction. The final project will also include a desert arboretum.

Mr. Kempton stated that the project is on a transportation corridor, referring to page 3, item B. Ms. O'Connor stated that Ms. Dye had wanted to know the area of the project? Mr. Cisson stated that the area is about 1000' long and 50' feet wide, and that emergency vehicles would be allowed. Ms. O'Connor asked how wide the actual path of travel would be, and if there would be dismount zones for bicyclists? Ms. O'Connor suggested that both bicyclists and pedestrians be allowed, but that their paths of travel be separated. Mr. Cisson replied that this is the intent, but that the final design is not yet completed. Ms. O'Connor requested that a cross-section be added to the application.

Co-Chair Hutchinson asked about the source of the local match, and Mr. Cisson replied that funds were being raised for the project. Also, once the master plan is completed, ASU will provide some funding for the undergrounding of the utilities. Ms. Ellis asked if an artist was involved, and asked that their involvement be noted in the application. Mr. Cisson noted that both the art department at ASU and the community artists would be involved. Mr. Cisson discussed some of the artistic opportunities available along the path, at nodes, and at bus stops. Ms. Ellis stated that water fountains could also be used. Mr. Cisson stated that is one possibility, although maintenance issues can be a concern.

Ms. O'Connor referred to the drawing displayed by Mr. Cisson, asking if the art elements would be in concrete? If so, there needs to be a clear path of travel for pedestrians to meet ADA needs. Mr. Kupel suggested that some historic interpretation of Dr. Backus be included in the project, and Mr. Cisson discussed this idea and the opportunities.

Mr. Kempton asked if this was a state or local application. Ms. Coomer replied that this was a local application. State applications must be on ADOT right of way. Ms. Coomer had confirmed that ASU could sponsor their own application with ADOT staff.

Mesa - South Canal Multi-Use Path

Andrea Madonna addressed the Working Group. She noted that this project would connect to two other canals, including historic and prehistoric canals. The project will also connect to bicycle lanes on Horne, and to parks. Asphalt will be used to meet the maintenance needs of SRP. SRP does support the project. A council resolution is forthcoming. Ms. Madonna referred committee members to the maps in the appendix.

Mr. Anderson stated that the segment being considered should be clearly shown on the project map in the appendix. Ms. Madonna explained the maps, and stated that the map would be changed. Ms. O'Connor asked if there are portions less than 10 feet in width, and Ms. Madonna stated that the path is 10 feet wide in all portions. Ms. O'Connor stated that the proposal is not eligible for category two, and that the reason for using asphalt instead of concrete should be explained in the application.

Mr. Kempton asked John Siefert if there were maintenance problems with using asphalt along the AC/DC in Phoenix. Mr. Siefert said that concrete is preferred for its durability. Tim Barnard, Mesa, added that dredging is still done on this segment and that asphalt is less expensive to repair. Mr. Kempton requested that the application address this issue.

Cave Creek - Town Core Pedestrian Pathway (The Walk)

Ian Cordwell addressed the Working Group. The project has been modified from prior years, but the goal remains to create a unified path and streetscape in the town core. This project, instead of using the sewer easement, will include a path along both sides of Cave Creek Road. The path will be concrete, and photos will be included in the final application. There will also be nodes throughout the path system, and these will be sponsored by local businesses. Support letters and a council resolution are forthcoming. The artists community is involved in the project and being consulted for the design of the nodes.

Ms. O'Connor noted that the changes to the application from prior years are very good. Ms. Dye had wanted to know how the parking would be changed, and Mr. Cordwell stated that the map in the appendix shows how the parking will be changed. Ms. O'Connor stated that the map needs to be better labeled to identify that it shows how parking will be changed. Ms. O'Connor stated that a cross-section would also improve the application. Six feet is narrow for a path, and is more appropriate for a pedestrian sidewalk. Mr. Cordwell stated that Cave Creek is four lanes with a median. Because the lanes are currently 12 feet wide, it may be possible to narrow them to 11 feet and add bike lanes with some easements. Ms. O'Connor suggested that this be added to the application, adding that exposed aggregate is not as friendly as concrete.

Mr. Kupel stated that letters of recommendation are needed. Ms. Ellis requested that the role of the Sonoran Art Group be added to the application.

7. Other Items Relevant to the Round XII and Future Enhancement Fund Applications

The Working Group discussed other items relevant to this funding cycle and future enhancement fund cycles. Ms. Ellis asked when revised applications are due from applicants. Ms. Coomer replied they are due at the end of August. Ms. Coomer added that she would summarize the comments of the committee today, fax them to applicants, and that the applicant's responses to committee comments are due by Noon on Friday.

Ms. O'Connor noted that there were a lot of PowerPoint presentations this year, and this might put a hardship on some city staff. Mr. Anderson stated that the presentations do help to explain the project but should not be required. The applications must stand on their own merit. Ms. Coomer stated that applicants are given the choice of whether to use PowerPoint to explain their projects, and that the Working Group does not have a formal policy regarding the use of PowerPoint.

Mr. Kempton asked if the use of tabs as was done on the Mesa application would be acceptable to the TERC, and Ms. Coomer replied that she was not sure. Ms. Ellis asked about the date of the TERC meeting, and Ms. Coomer replied that it was scheduled for the 2nd week of October. The dates can be confirmed and sent to committee members.

8. Future Meeting Dates

The next meeting of the Enhancement Funds Working Group will be held **Tuesday, June 29, 2004 at 8:30 a.m.** in the MAG Cholla Room. The purpose of this meeting will be to rank enhancement fund applications. Ms. Ellis noted that her rankings would be submitted to MAG staff prior to the meeting since she would be out of town.

If necessary, a **tentative meeting** has been scheduled for **Tuesday, July 6, 2004 at 8:30 a.m.**

The meeting adjourned at Noon.